Case 4:11-cv-00368-WJN,-DB, Document 40 Filed 06/09/11 Page 1 of 4

United States District Court

Part the FILED

Middle District of pennewal Mansport

JUN 09 21

Pen Cett

DEPUTYCLEAR

VS.

Warden Bledsoe et al

Worden Bledsoe et al Memorandum Of Liouu Under Liocal Bule 7.7

Plowcomes forman Plabir Chelton, plaintiff, herein above case pro-se fashion.

1.) Affirming injunction based on generalized increase of harassment, and retaliationly conduct in violence attributed to random assignment to cellmate that non-muslim and placing non-muslims in rec case's with me. officials are liable based on genral danger arising from prison official and prison enviorment that both stimulated and condoned violance. I am not asking this honorable Court to just sive a watchful eye to this matter but actually prevent any more unpleasant wrongful retalictary acts or events to happen again.

2.) See, e.g. Wilson v. New york 303 A.D. 2d. 678,679, 760, N. y. S. 2d. 51,52 (2d Dept-2003). And also see, Ashcraft Vs, King 228 cal, App. 3d 604.613, Cal, App. 2d. Dist 1991). and see. Hudson vs. Mc Willian 503-US. 1, (1992)

3.) Is to the conditions of my confinement, I was attacked and assaulted twice by two different gang members. One on Lugust 30, 2009. I was beaten for a whole three minutes with my hards coffed behind my back and the s.m.c. officials watched in did nothing to stop it. Ind again on You, 26. % Raup forced a gang member in to my cell against my will. Ind threaten me with estraints. we both stated in a local voice it would not work out for us to be cellies. That morning after given the officer actual knowledge, I was jumped from behind punched and kicked to the face and body.

4.) Prison officials knew or should have known placing a muslim in a cell against his will to live with a gang member shows there has been a pattern of their abuse of authority and that there was a threat of more abuse by continully placing plaintiff in cells with none muslims. "Plaintiffs incident reports reveals that truth. "Plate. No state shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. Plaintiff claims for amended injunctive relife are authorized by 28 U.S.C. section 2283 & 2284 and Rule 65 of the fed. R. Ciu. P.

5.) The plaintiff has no plain, adequate or complete remedy at law to redress the wrongs described herein. Plaintiff, has been and will continue to be irreparably injuryed by the conduct of the defendants un-less this honorable Court grants the declaratory and admended injunction. Relife which plaintiffs seeks Prison officials by their own omission caused a liberty interest and atypical incident of prison life, See, Lyers, V. Ryan 152 F. 2d 71 (2d cir. 1998) taylor us. Radriguez 238. F. 2d 188 (2d cir. 2001). And Hatch V. District of Columbia 184 F. 3d 848 (D.C. cir 1999).

6.) Plaintiff is a muslim illustrates the seriously affect of plaintiffs health and safety, prison afficials would not place a skin head in the cell with a muslim or the other way around. They denied those rights to plaintiff. See Barney 15, pulsipher, 143 f. 2d 1299, 1311 10th cir 1998) And see, Rauser 15, Horn, 2411 f. 3d 330 (3d cir 2001).

Con Clusion,

plaintiff prays that this honorable court have plaintiff transfer to a different institution. "They have throw away my out going legal mail.

Dated 5-28-11

Submitted Norman N. She Han 45969-066 U.S. P.L. P. O. Box 1000 Lewisburg Pa, 17837

Certificate of Service

that the foregoing is true and correct. It mailed the following motion to.

United States District Court

For the

Middle District of pennsylvania

U.S. courthouse 218

240 west third st

Williams port, pa. 17701-6460

Dated 5-28-11

Norman Wabir Shelton #45969-066 U.S. P.L. P.O. Box 1000 Lewisburg Pa. 17857.

